



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,335	07/09/2003	Vlasta Brusic Kaufman	98010CONDIV	1377

29050 7590 03/25/2005

STEVEN D WESEMAN, ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL, IP  
CABOT MICROELECTRONICS CORPORATION  
870 NORTH COMMONS DRIVE  
AURORA, IL 60504

EXAMINER	
GOUDREAU, GEORGE A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1763	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/616,335

Applicant(s)

KAUFMAN ET AL.

Examiner

George A. Goudreau

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

*G. Goudreau*  
GEORGE GOUDREAU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

3-051

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1763

1. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

-In line 3 of claim 1, the phrase "having and abrasive" is confusing, and should be reworded.;

-The % sign is missing after the number 16.7 in line 2 of claim 7.; and

-The usage of the phrase "is at least one metal oxide" in claim 9 is confusing, and should be reworded.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-18 of U.S.

Patent No. 6,432,828. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

patentably distinct from each other because of the following. US patent 6,432,828

claims a narrower version of the same invention as that which is claimed in the pending application.

Art Unit: 1763

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kido (5,800,577).

Kido discloses a cmp process for cmp polishing a metal layer (i.e.-Cu, etc.) on a wafer using a cmp slurry, which does not contain a separate film forming agent. The cmp slurry is comprised of the following components:

- DI H<sub>2</sub>O;
- an oxidizer (i.e.-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, etc.);
- a carboxylic acid (i.e.-tartaric acid, malic acid, citric acid, etc.);
- phosphoric acid, and
- metal oxide abrasive particules (i.e.-silica, alumina, titania, zirconia, etc.)

Art Unit: 1763

The PH of the cmp slurry is adjusted between (6-8).

This is discussed specifically in columns 4-7; and discussed in general in columns 1-16. Kido fails, however, to specifically disclose the following aspects of applicant's claimed invention:

- the specific cmp polishing process parameters which are claimed by the applicant; and
- the specific usage of a surfactant in the cmp slurry

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to employ a surfactant in the cmp slurry taught above based upon the following. The usage of a surfactant in a cmp slurry is conventional or at least well known in the cmp polishing arts. (The examiner takes official notice in this regard.) Further, it would have been desirable to employ a surfactant in the cmp slurry taught above in order to improve the ability of the cmp slurry to cmp polish the Cu layer on the wafer by improving the wetting of the Cu layer with the cmp slurry.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one skilled in the art to employ any of a variety of different cmp polishing process parameters in the cmp polishing process taught above including those which are specifically claimed by the applicant. These are all well-known variables in the cmp polishing art, which are known to affect both the rate and the quality of the cmp polishing process. Further, the selection of particular values for these variables would not necessitate any undue experimentation, which would have been indicative of unexpected results.

Art Unit: 1763


Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to employ the specific cmp polishing process parameters which are claimed by the applicant in the cmp polishing process taught above based upon *In re Aller* as cited below.

"Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F. 2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA).

Further, all of the specific cmp polishing process parameters which are claimed by the applicant are results effective variables whose values whose values are known to affect both the rate, and the quality of the cmp polishing process.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner George A. Goudreau at telephone number (571)-272-1434.

  
George A. Goudreau  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1763